Boxes and Diamonds

An Open Introduction to Modal Logic

Remixed by Richard Zach

Typeset in Baskervald X and Nimbus Sans by LaTeX.

This version of *Boxes and Diamonds* is revision ed40131 (2021-07-11), with content generated from *Open Logic Text* revision 492ee1e (2022-01-07). Free download at:

https://bd.openlogicproject.org/

APPENDIX A

Sets

A.1 Extensionality

A *set* is a collection of objects, considered as a single object. The objects making up the set are called *elements* or *members* of the set. If x is an element of a set a, we write $x \in a$; if not, we write $x \notin a$. The set which has no elements is called the *empty* set and denoted "$\emptyset$".

It does not matter how we *specify* the set, or how we *order* its elements, or indeed how *many times* we count its elements. All that matters are what its elements are. We codify this in the following principle.

Definition A.1 (Extensionality). If A and B are sets, then $A = B$ iff every element of A is also an element of B, and vice versa.

Extensionality licenses some notation. In general, when we have some objects $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, then $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ is *the* set whose elements are $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. We emphasise the word "*the*", since extensionality tells us that there can be only *one* such set. Indeed, extensionality also licenses the following:

$$\{a, a, b\} = \{a, b\} = \{b, a\}.$$

This delivers on the point that, when we consider sets, we don't care about the order of their elements, or how many times they are specified.

Example A.2. Whenever you have a bunch of objects, you can collect them together in a set. The set of Richard's siblings, for instance, is a set that contains one person, and we could write it as $S = \{\text{Ruth}\}$. The set of positive integers less than 4 is $\{1, 2, 3\}$, but it can also be written as $\{3, 2, 1\}$ or even as $\{1, 2, 1, 2, 3\}$. These are all the same set, by extensionality. For every element of $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is also an element of $\{3, 2, 1\}$ (and of $\{1, 2, 1, 2, 3\}$), and vice versa.

Frequently we'll specify a set by some property that its elements share. We'll use the following shorthand notation for that: $\{x : \varphi(x)\}$, where the $\varphi(x)$ stands for the property that x has to have in order to be counted among the elements of the set.

Example A.3. In our example, we could have specified S also as

$$S = \{x : x \text{ is a sibling of Richard}\}.$$

Example A.4. A number is called *perfect* iff it is equal to the sum of its proper divisors (i.e., numbers that evenly divide it but aren't identical to the number). For instance, 6 is perfect because its proper divisors are 1, 2, and 3, and $6 = 1 + 2 + 3$. In fact, 6 is the only positive integer less than 10 that is perfect. So, using extensionality, we can say:

$$\{6\} = \{x : x \text{ is perfect and } 0 \leq x \leq 10\}$$

We read the notation on the right as "the set of x's such that x is perfect and $0 \leq x \leq 10$". The identity here confirms that, when we consider sets, we don't care about how they are specified. And, more generally, extensionality guarantees that there is always only one set of x's such that $\varphi(x)$. So, extensionality justifies calling $\{x : \varphi(x)\}$ *the* set of x's such that $\varphi(x)$.

Extensionality gives us a way for showing that sets are identical: to show that $A = B$, show that whenever $x \in A$ then also $x \in B$, and whenever $y \in B$ then also $y \in A$.

A.2   Subsets and Power Sets

We will often want to compare sets. And one obvious kind of comparison one might make is as follows: *everything in one set is in the other too.* This situation is sufficiently important for us to introduce some new notation.

Definition A.5 (Subset). If every element of a set A is also an element of B, then we say that A is a *subset* of B, and write $A \subseteq B$. If A is not a subset of B we write $A \nsubseteq B$. If $A \subseteq B$ but $A \neq B$, we write $A \subsetneq B$ and say that A is a *proper subset* of B.

Example A.6. Every set is a subset of itself, and $\emptyset$ is a subset of every set. The set of even numbers is a subset of the set of natural numbers. Also, $\{a, b\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$. But $\{a, b, e\}$ is not a subset of $\{a, b, c\}$.

Example A.7. The number 2 is an element of the set of integers, whereas the set of even numbers is a subset of the set of integers. However, a set may happen to *both* be an element and a subset of some other set, e.g., $\{0\} \in \{0, \{0\}\}$ and also $\{0\} \subseteq \{0, \{0\}\}$.

Extensionality gives a criterion of identity for sets: $A = B$ iff every element of A is also an element of B and vice versa. The definition of "subset" defines $A \subseteq B$ precisely as the first half of this criterion: every element of A is also an element of B. Of course the definition also applies if we switch A and B: that is, $B \subseteq A$ iff every element of B is also an element of A. And that, in turn, is exactly the "vice versa" part of extensionality. In other words, extensionality entails that sets are equal iff they are subsets of one another.

Proposition A.8. *A = B iff both A ⊆ B and B ⊆ A.*

Now is also a good opportunity to introduce some further bits of helpful notation. In defining when A is a subset of B we said that "every element of A is ...," and filled the "..." with "an element of B". But this is such a common *shape* of expression that it will be helpful to introduce some formal notation for it.

Definition A.9. $(\forall x \in A)\varphi$ abbreviates $\forall x(x \in A \rightarrow \varphi)$. Similarly, $(\exists x \in A)\varphi$ abbreviates $\exists x(x \in A \wedge \varphi)$.

Using this notation, we can say that $A \subseteq B$ iff $(\forall x \in A)x \in B$.

Now we move on to considering a certain kind of set: the set of all subsets of a given set.

Definition A.10 (Power Set). The set consisting of all subsets of a set A is called the *power set of A*, written $\wp(A)$.

$$\wp(A) = \{B : B \subseteq A\}$$

Example A.11. What are all the possible subsets of $\{a, b, c\}$? They are: $\emptyset$, $\{a\}$, $\{b\}$, $\{c\}$, $\{a, b\}$, $\{a, c\}$, $\{b, c\}$, $\{a, b, c\}$. The set of all these subsets is $\wp(\{a, b, c\})$:

$$\wp(\{a, b, c\}) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$$

A.3   Some Important Sets

Example A.12. We will mostly be dealing with sets whose elements are mathematical objects. Four such sets are important enough to have specific names:

$\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$

the set of natural numbers

$\mathbb{Z} = \{\ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$

the set of integers

$$\mathbb{Q} = \{m/n : m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } n \neq 0\}$$

the set of rationals

$$\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \infty)$$

the set of real numbers (the continuum)

These are all *infinite* sets, that is, they each have infinitely many elements.

As we move through these sets, we are adding *more* numbers to our stock. Indeed, it should be clear that $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$: after all, every natural number is an integer; every integer is a rational; and every rational is a real. Equally, it should be clear that $\mathbb{N} \subsetneq \mathbb{Z} \subsetneq \mathbb{Q}$, since -1 is an integer but not a natural number, and $1/2$ is rational but not integer. It is less obvious that $\mathbb{Q} \subsetneq \mathbb{R}$, i.e., that there are some real numbers which are not rational.

We'll sometimes also use the set of positive integers $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and the set containing just the first two natural numbers $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$.

Example A.13 (Strings). Another interesting example is the set A^* of *finite strings* over an alphabet A: any finite sequence of elements of A is a string over A. We include the *empty string* Λ among the strings over A, for every alphabet A. For instance,

$$\mathbb{B}^* = \{\Lambda, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11,$$
$$000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111, 0000, \dots\}.$$

If $x = x_1 \dots x_n \in A^*$ is a string consisting of n "letters" from A, then we say *length* of the string is n and write $\text{len}(x) = n$.

Example A.14 (Infinite sequences). For any set A we may also consider the set A^ω of infinite sequences of elements of A. An infinite sequence $a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 \dots$ consists of a one-way infinite list of objects, each one of which is an element of A.

Figure A.1: The union $A \cup B$ of two sets is set of elements of A together with those of B.

A.4   Unions and Intersections

In appendix A.1, we introduced definitions of sets by abstraction, i.e., definitions of the form $\{x : \varphi(x)\}$. Here, we invoke some property φ, and this property can mention sets we've already defined. So for instance, if A and B are sets, the set $\{x : x \in A \vee x \in B\}$ consists of all those objects which are elements of either A or B, i.e., it's the set that combines the elements of A and B. We can visualize this as in Figure A.1, where the highlighted area indicates the elements of the two sets A and B together.

This operation on sets—combining them—is very useful and common, and so we give it a formal name and a symbol.

Definition A.15 (Union). The *union* of two sets A and B, written $A \cup B$, is the set of all things which are elements of A, B, or both.
$$A \cup B = \{x : x \in A \vee x \in B\}$$

Example A.16. Since the multiplicity of elements doesn't matter, the union of two sets which have an element in common contains that element only once, e.g., $\{a, b, c\} \cup \{a, 0, 1\} = \{a, b, c, 0, 1\}$.

The union of a set and one of its subsets is just the bigger set: $\{a, b, c\} \cup \{a\} = \{a, b, c\}$.

Figure A.2: The intersection $A \cap B$ of two sets is the set of elements they have in common.

The union of a set with the empty set is identical to the set: $\{a,b,c\} \cup \emptyset = \{a,b,c\}$.

We can also consider a "dual" operation to union. This is the operation that forms the set of all elements that are elements of A and are also elements of B. This operation is called *intersection*, and can be depicted as in Figure A.2.

Definition A.17 (Intersection). The *intersection* of two sets A and B, written $A \cap B$, is the set of all things which are elements of both A and B.

$$A \cap B = \{x : x \in A \wedge x \in B\}$$

Two sets are called *disjoint* if their intersection is empty. This means they have no elements in common.

Example A.18. If two sets have no elements in common, their intersection is empty: $\{a,b,c\} \cap \{0,1\} = \emptyset$.

If two sets do have elements in common, their intersection is the set of all those: $\{a,b,c\} \cap \{a,b,d\} = \{a,b\}$.

The intersection of a set with one of its subsets is just the smaller set: $\{a,b,c\} \cap \{a,b\} = \{a,b\}$.

The intersection of any set with the empty set is empty: $\{a, b, c\} \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$.

We can also form the union or intersection of more than two sets. An elegant way of dealing with this in general is the following: suppose you collect all the sets you want to form the union (or intersection) of into a single set. Then we can define the union of all our original sets as the set of all objects which belong to at least one element of the set, and the intersection as the set of all objects which belong to every element of the set.

Definition A.19. If A is a set of sets, then $\bigcup A$ is the set of elements of elements of A:

$$\bigcup A = \{x : x \text{ belongs to an element of } A\}, \text{ i.e.,}$$
$$= \{x : \text{there is a } B \in A \text{ so that } x \in B\}$$

Definition A.20. If A is a set of sets, then $\bigcap A$ is the set of objects which all elements of A have in common:

$$\bigcap A = \{x : x \text{ belongs to every element of } A\}, \text{ i.e.,}$$
$$= \{x : \text{for all } B \in A, x \in B\}$$

Example A.21. Suppose $A = \{\{a, b\}, \{a, d, e\}, \{a, d\}\}$. Then $\bigcup A = \{a, b, d, e\}$ and $\bigcap A = \{a\}$.

We could also do the same for a sequence of sets $A_1, A_2, \ldots$

$$\bigcup_i A_i = \{x : x \text{ belongs to one of the } A_i\}$$
$$\bigcap_i A_i = \{x : x \text{ belongs to every } A_i\}.$$

When we have an *index* of sets, i.e., some set I such that we are considering A_i for each $i \in I$, we may also use these

Figure A.3: The difference $A \setminus B$ of two sets is the set of those elements of A which are not also elements of B.

abbreviations:

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i = \bigcup \{A_i : i \in I\}$$
$$\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i = \bigcap \{A_i : i \in I\}$$

Finally, we may want to think about the set of all elements in A which are not in B. We can depict this as in Figure A.3.

Definition A.22 (Difference). The *set difference* $A \setminus B$ is the set of all elements of A which are not also elements of B, i.e.,

$$A \setminus B = \{x : x \in A \text{ and } x \notin B\}.$$

A.5   Pairs, Tuples, Cartesian Products

It follows from extensionality that sets have no order to their elements. So if we want to represent order, we use *ordered pairs* $\langle x, y \rangle$. In an unordered pair $\{x, y\}$, the order does not matter: $\{x, y\} = \{y, x\}$. In an ordered pair, it does: if $x \neq y$, then $\langle x, y \rangle \neq \langle y, x \rangle$.

How should we think about ordered pairs in set theory? Crucially, we want to preserve the idea that ordered pairs are identical iff they share the same first element and share the same

second element, i.e.:

$$\langle a, b \rangle = \langle c, d \rangle \text{ iff both } a = c \text{ and } b = d.$$

We can define ordered pairs in set theory using the Wiener-Kuratowski definition.

Definition A.23 (Ordered pair). $\langle a, b \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$.

Having fixed a definition of an ordered pair, we can use it to define further sets. For example, sometimes we also want ordered sequences of more than two objects, e.g., *triples* $\langle x, y, z \rangle$, *quadruples* $\langle x, y, z, u \rangle$, and so on. We can think of triples as special ordered pairs, where the first element is itself an ordered pair: $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ is $\langle \langle x, y \rangle, z \rangle$. The same is true for quadruples: $\langle x, y, z, u \rangle$ is $\langle \langle \langle x, y \rangle, z \rangle, u \rangle$, and so on. In general, we talk of *ordered n-tuples* $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$.

Certain sets of ordered pairs, or other ordered *n*-tuples, will be useful.

Definition A.24 (Cartesian product). Given sets A and B, their *Cartesian product $A \times B$* is defined by

$$A \times B = \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in A \text{ and } y \in B\}.$$

Example A.25. If $A = \{0, 1\}$, and $B = \{1, a, b\}$, then their product is

$$A \times B = \{\langle 0, 1 \rangle, \langle 0, a \rangle, \langle 0, b \rangle, \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, a \rangle, \langle 1, b \rangle\}.$$

Example A.26. If A is a set, the product of A with itself, $A \times A$, is also written A^2. It is the set of *all* pairs $\langle x, y \rangle$ with $x, y \in A$. The set of all triples $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ is A^3, and so on. We can give a recursive definition:

$$A^1 = A$$
$$A^{k+1} = A^k \times A$$

Proposition A.27. *If A has n elements and B has m elements, then $A \times B$ has $n \cdot m$ elements.*

Proof. For every element x in A, there are m elements of the form $\langle x, y \rangle \in A \times B$. Let $B_x = \{\langle x, y \rangle : y \in B\}$. Since whenever $x_1 \neq x_2$, $\langle x_1, y \rangle \neq \langle x_2, y \rangle$, $B_{x_1} \cap B_{x_2} = \emptyset$. But if $A = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, then $A \times B = B_{x_1} \cup \cdots \cup B_{x_n}$, and so has $n \cdot m$ elements.

To visualize this, arrange the elements of $A \times B$ in a grid:

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_{x_1} &= \{\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \quad \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle \quad \ldots \quad \langle x_1, y_m \rangle\} \\
B_{x_2} &= \{\langle x_2, y_1 \rangle \quad \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \quad \ldots \quad \langle x_2, y_m \rangle\} \\
&\;\;\vdots \qquad\qquad\qquad \vdots \\
B_{x_n} &= \{\langle x_n, y_1 \rangle \quad \langle x_n, y_2 \rangle \quad \ldots \quad \langle x_n, y_m \rangle\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the x_i are all different, and the y_j are all different, no two of the pairs in this grid are the same, and there are $n \cdot m$ of them.□

Example A.28. If A is a set, a *word* over A is any sequence of elements of A. A sequence can be thought of as an n-tuple of elements of A. For instance, if $A = \{a, b, c\}$, then the sequence "*bac*" can be thought of as the triple $\langle b, a, c \rangle$. Words, i.e., sequences of symbols, are of crucial importance in computer science. By convention, we count elements of A as sequences of length 1, and $\emptyset$ as the sequence of length 0. The set of *all* words over A then is

$$A^* = \{\emptyset\} \cup A \cup A^2 \cup A^3 \cup \ldots$$

A.6   Russell's Paradox

Extensionality licenses the notation $\{x : \varphi(x)\}$, for *the* set of x's such that $\varphi(x)$. However, all that extensionality *really* licenses is the following thought. *If* there is a set whose members are all and only the φ's, *then* there is only one such set. Otherwise put: having fixed some φ, the set $\{x : \varphi(x)\}$ is unique, *if it exists.*

But this conditional is important! Crucially, not every property lends itself to *comprehension*. That is, some properties do *not*

define sets. If they all did, then we would run into outright contra-dictions. The most famous example of this is Russell's Paradox.

Sets may be elements of other sets—for instance, the power set of a set A is made up of sets. And so it makes sense to ask or investigate whether a set is an element of another set. Can a set be a member of itself? Nothing about the idea of a set seems to rule this out. For instance, if *all* sets form a collection of objects, one might think that they can be collected into a single set—the set of all sets. And it, being a set, would be an element of the set of all sets.

Russell's Paradox arises when we consider the property of not having itself as an element, of being *non-self-membered*. What if we suppose that there is a set of all sets that do not have themselves as an element? Does

$$R = \{x : x \notin x\}$$

exist? It turns out that we can prove that it does not.

Theorem A.29 (Russell's Paradox). *There is no set $R = \{x : x \notin x\}$.*

Proof. If $R = \{x : x \notin x\}$ exists, then $R \in R$ iff $R \notin R$, which is a contradiction.   □

Let's run through this proof more slowly. If R exists, it makes sense to ask whether $R \in R$ or not. Suppose that indeed $R \in R$. Now, R was defined as the set of all sets that are not elements of themselves. So, if $R \in R$, then R does not itself have R's defining property. But only sets that have this property are in R, hence, R cannot be an element of R, i.e., $R \notin R$. But R can't both be and not be an element of R, so we have a contradiction.

Since the assumption that $R \in R$ leads to a contradiction, we have $R \notin R$. But this also leads to a contradiction! For if $R \notin R$, then R itself does have R's defining property, and so R would be an element of R just like all the other non-self-membered sets. And again, it can't both not be and be an element of R.

How do we set up a set theory which avoids falling into Russell's Paradox, i.e., which avoids making the *inconsistent* claim that $R = \{x : x \notin x\}$ exists? Well, we would need to lay down axioms which give us very precise conditions for stating when sets exist (and when they don't).

The set theory sketched in this chapter doesn't do this. It's *genuinely naïve.* It tells you only that sets obey extensionality and that, if you have some sets, you can form their union, intersection, etc. It is possible to develop set theory more rigorously than this.

Problems

Problem A.1. Prove that there is at most one empty set, i.e., show that if A and B are sets without elements, then $A = B$.

Problem A.2. List all subsets of $\{a, b, c, d\}$.

Problem A.3. Show that if A has n elements, then $\wp(A)$ has 2^n elements.

Problem A.4. Prove that if $A \subseteq B$, then $A \cup B = B$.

Problem A.5. Prove rigorously that if $A \subseteq B$, then $A \cap B = A$.

Problem A.6. Show that if A is a set and $A \in B$, then $A \subseteq \bigcup B$.

Problem A.7. Prove that if $A \subsetneq B$, then $B \setminus A \neq \emptyset$.

Problem A.8. Using Definition A.23, prove that $\langle a, b \rangle = \langle c, d \rangle$ iff both $a = c$ and $b = d$.

Problem A.9. List all elements of $\{1, 2, 3\}^3$.

Problem A.10. Show, by induction on k, that for all $k \geq 1$, if A has n elements, then A^k has n^k elements.

Relations

B.1   Relations as Sets

In appendix A.3, we mentioned some important sets: $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{R}$. You will no doubt remember some interesting relations between the elements of some of these sets. For instance, each of these sets has a completely standard *order relation* on it. There is also the relation *is identical with* that every object bears to itself and to no other thing. There are many more interesting relations that we'll encounter, and even more possible relations. Before we review them, though, we will start by pointing out that we can look at relations as a special sort of set.

For this, recall two things from appendix A.5. First, recall the notion of a *ordered pair*: given a and b, we can form $\langle a, b \rangle$. Importantly, the order of elements *does* matter here. So if $a \neq b$ then $\langle a, b \rangle \neq \langle b, a \rangle$. (Contrast this with unordered pairs, i.e., 2-element sets, where $\{a, b\} = \{b, a\}$.) Second, recall the notion of a *Cartesian product*: if A and B are sets, then we can form $A \times B$, the set of all pairs $\langle x, y \rangle$ with $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. In particular, $A^2 = A \times A$ is the set of all ordered pairs from A.

Now we will consider a particular relation on a set: the $<$-relation on the set $\mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers. Consider the set of all pairs of numbers $\langle n, m \rangle$ where $n < m$, i.e.,

$$R = \{\langle n, m \rangle : n, m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n < m\}.$$

There is a close connection between n being less than m, and the pair $\langle n, m \rangle$ being a member of R, namely:

$$n < m \text{ iff } \langle n, m \rangle \in R.$$

Indeed, without any loss of information, we can consider the set R to *be* the $<$-relation on $\mathbb{N}$.

In the same way we can construct a subset of $\mathbb{N}^2$ for any relation between numbers. Conversely, given any set of pairs of numbers $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$, there is a corresponding relation between numbers, namely, the relationship n bears to m if and only if $\langle n, m \rangle \in S$. This justifies the following definition:

Definition B.1 (Binary relation). A *binary relation* on a set A is a subset of A^2. If $R \subseteq A^2$ is a binary relation on A and $x, y \in A$, we sometimes write Rxy (or xRy) for $\langle x, y \rangle \in R$.

Example B.2. The set $\mathbb{N}^2$ of pairs of natural numbers can be listed in a 2-dimensional matrix like this:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\langle \mathbf{0,0} \rangle & \langle 0,1 \rangle & \langle 0,2 \rangle & \langle 0,3 \rangle & \ldots \\
\langle 1,0 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{1,1} \rangle & \langle 1,2 \rangle & \langle 1,3 \rangle & \ldots \\
\langle 2,0 \rangle & \langle 2,1 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{2,2} \rangle & \langle 2,3 \rangle & \ldots \\
\langle 3,0 \rangle & \langle 3,1 \rangle & \langle 3,2 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{3,3} \rangle & \ldots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{array}
$$

We have put the diagonal, here, in bold, since the subset of $\mathbb{N}^2$ consisting of the pairs lying on the diagonal, i.e.,

$$\{ \langle 0,0 \rangle, \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle 2,2 \rangle, \ldots \},$$

is the *identity relation on* $\mathbb{N}$. (Since the identity relation is popular, let's define $\mathrm{Id}_A = \{ \langle x, x \rangle : x \in X \}$ for any set A.) The subset of all pairs lying above the diagonal, i.e.,

$$L = \{ \langle 0,1 \rangle, \langle 0,2 \rangle, \ldots, \langle 1,2 \rangle, \langle 1,3 \rangle, \ldots, \langle 2,3 \rangle, \langle 2,4 \rangle, \ldots \},$$

is the *less than* relation, i.e., Lnm iff $n < m$. The subset of pairs below the diagonal, i.e.,

$$G = \{\langle 1,0 \rangle, \langle 2,0 \rangle, \langle 2,1 \rangle, \langle 3,0 \rangle, \langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 3,2 \rangle, \dots \},$$

is the *greater than* relation, i.e., Gnm iff $n > m$. The union of L with I, which we might call $K = L \cup I$, is the *less than or equal to* relation: Knm iff $n \le m$. Similarly, $H = G \cup I$ is the *greater than or equal to relation*. These relations L, G, K, and H are special kinds of relations called *orders*. L and G have the property that no number bears L or G to itself (i.e., for all n, neither Lnn nor Gnn). Relations with this property are called *irreflexive*, and, if they also happen to be orders, they are called *strict orders*.

Although orders and identity are important and natural relations, it should be emphasized that according to our definition *any* subset of A^2 is a relation on A, regardless of how unnatural or contrived it seems. In particular, $\emptyset$ is a relation on any set (the *empty relation*, which no pair of elements bears), and A^2 itself is a relation on A as well (one which every pair bears), called the *universal relation*. But also something like $E = \{\langle n,m \rangle : n > 5 \text{ or } m \times n \ge 34\}$ counts as a relation.

B.2 Special Properties of Relations

Some kinds of relations turn out to be so common that they have been given special names. For instance, $\le$ and $\subseteq$ both relate their respective domains (say, $\mathbb{N}$ in the case of $\le$ and $\wp(A)$ in the case of $\subseteq$) in similar ways. To get at exactly how these relations are similar, and how they differ, we categorize them according to some special properties that relations can have. It turns out that (combinations of) some of these special properties are especially important: orders and equivalence relations.

Definition B.3 (Reflexivity). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is *reflexive* iff, for every $x \in A$, Rxx.

Definition B.4 (Transitivity). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is *transitive* iff, whenever Rxy and Ryz, then also Rxz.

Definition B.5 (Symmetry). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is *symmetric* iff, whenever Rxy, then also Ryx.

Definition B.6 (Anti-symmetry). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is *anti-symmetric* iff, whenever both Rxy and Ryx, then $x = y$ (or, in other words: if $x \neq y$ then either $\neg Rxy$ or $\neg Ryx$).

In a symmetric relation, Rxy and Ryx always hold together, or neither holds. In an anti-symmetric relation, the only way for Rxy and Ryx to hold together is if $x = y$. Note that this does not *require* that Rxy and Ryx holds when $x = y$, only that it isn't ruled out. So an anti-symmetric relation can be reflexive, but it is not the case that every anti-symmetric relation is reflexive. Also note that being anti-symmetric and merely not being symmetric are different conditions. In fact, a relation can be both symmetric and anti-symmetric at the same time (e.g., the identity relation is).

Definition B.7 (Connectivity). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is *connected* if for all $x, y \in A$, if $x \neq y$, then either Rxy or Ryx.

Definition B.8 (Irreflexivity). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is called *irreflexive* if, for all $x \in A$, not Rxx.

Definition B.9 (Asymmetry). A relation $R \subseteq A^2$ is called *asymmetric* if for no pair $x, y \in A$ we have both Rxy and Ryx.

Note that if $A \neq \emptyset$, then no irreflexive relation on A is reflexive and every asymmetric relation on A is also anti-symmetric. However, there are $R \subseteq A^2$ that are not reflexive and also not irreflexive, and there are anti-symmetric relations that are not asymmetric.